

On Korean Adverbs Licensed by Metalinguistic Negation

Ilkyu Kim
(Kangwon National University)

Kim, Ilkyu. (2014). On Korean Adverbs Licensed by Metalinguistic Negation. *Language Research*, 50.3, 627-645.

Korean adverbs like *yekan*, *pothong*, and *com*, traditionally known as negative polarity items (NPIs), have recently been denied of their status as NPIs and argued to be licensed by metalinguistic negation (MN). However, little attention has been paid to the exact relation between the three adverbs and MN, although it is necessary to deeply understand semantic/pragmatic properties of those words. The purpose of this paper is to provide a deeper understanding of these words by exploring how they interact with various linguistic phenomena related to MN. Particularly, another Korean adverb *kunyang* is also discussed. The two main arguments of the paper are that 1) the four adverbs behave not uniformly but differently with respect to MN, particularly regarding how much they have been fossilized to have emphatic positive meaning and what types of negative expressions they go along with and 2) *com* is the most prototypical adverb licensed by MN, and the order of prototypicality is *kunyang*, *pothong*, and *yekan*, which contradicts previous analyses that take *pothong* and *yekan* to be the exemplar cases of adverbs licensed by MN.

Keywords: metalinguistic negation, adverbs, *yekan*, *pothong*, *com*, *kunyang*, Korean

1. Introduction

Korean adverbs *yekan* ‘some, a little’ and *pothong* ‘commonly’ sometimes have been mentioned in discussing Korean adverb NPIs, but no serious research had been conducted on these words until Cho & Lee (2002) first discussed in detail the syntactic and semantic/pragmatic nature of *yekan* (but not *pothong*).¹⁾

1) Their analysis is further developed by Lee & Cho (2004).

More recently, based on the fact that, unlike other adverb NPIs, they convey emphatically positive stronger degree, Lee (2008) has questioned their status as NPIs and argued that these adverbs are licensed by meta-linguistic negation (MN). His analysis of *yekan* and *pothong* are more elaborated in his later works (Lee 2010a, b), with another adverb *com* 'a little' added to the list of MN-taking adverbs (Lee 2010b).

Although Lee (2008, 2010a, b) opened a way for gaining deeper insights into the semantics/pragmatics of *yekan*, *pothong*, and *com* by drawing MN into the discussion, much seems to remain for further investigation in order to fully understand how they are exactly related to MN. Particularly, similarities and differences between these adverbs with respect to MN-related phenomena have not been examined in any detail. For example, Lee (2010b) claims that about half of the properties of *yekan* and *pothong* are shared by *com*, but does not show exactly which aspects they share and which they do not.

The main purpose of this paper is to provide a better understanding of the semantics/pragmatics of *yekan*, *pothong*, *com* and one other MN-taking adverb, *kunyang* 'just'²⁾, which is first introduced in this paper as an adverb licensed by MN. It will be claimed that these four adverbs (henceforth, *yekan*-adverbs) have their own properties rather than showing a homogeneous behavior in terms of MN-related phenomena, due to different degrees of fossilization and collocational patterns.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In section 2, I briefly introduce one main characteristic of the *yekan*-adverbs that distinguish them from other adverb NPIs, that is, their being licensed by MN in negative utterances (Lee 2008, 2010a, b). Then, in section 3, their relation to MN will be investigated in detail, based on various diagnostics for MN which have been proposed by earlier works (e.g. Horn 2001, Lee 2010b). How they interact with MN will be shown to crucially depend on lexical factors such as the degree of fossilization and collocational patterns. Section 4 concludes the paper.

2) The meaning of *kunyang* seems best be captured by that of *just* in English. But as will be shown below, they are not exactly the same although there is some overlap between the two.

2. *Yekan*-adverbs are not NPIs

Example (1) shows that *yekan* ‘some, a little’ and *pothong* ‘commonly’ are different from ordinary adverb NPIs, which are licensed by descriptive negation (DN).

- (1) Mia-nun pothong/yekan yeppu-ci-ka anh-a
 Mia-TOP³⁾ commonly/a little pretty-ADV-NOM not-DEC
 ‘(lit.) Mia is not commonly/a little pretty.’
 ‘(intended) Mia is very pretty.’

That is, although the sentence in (1) contains a negative expression, commonly known as the long-form negation (LFN) *-ci anh-* ‘not’, it does not convey any negative meaning; rather, as shown in the translation, its intended meaning is that ‘Mia is very (much) pretty’. Lee (2010a, b) claims that this emphatic positive meaning is possible because *pothong/yekan* is licensed by MN but not by DN, which leads him to argue against previous studies that take these adverbs to be NPIs (e.g. Carston & Noh 1996, Cho & Lee 2002, Lee & Cho 2004).

There are more adverbs that necessarily take negative forms (and thus commonly classified as NPIs) and behave similar to *yekan* and *pothong*. They are *com* ‘a little’ with a phonetic stress⁴⁾ and *kunyang* ‘just’. *Com* is discussed briefly by Lee (2010b) as an adverb that is about half similar to *yekan/pothong*, and *kunyang* is newly introduced in this paper. At first glance, they indeed show the same property with *yekan* and *pothong* as shown in (2).

- (2) Kim-un **com**⁵⁾/kunyang yeppu-n kes-i ani-ya
 Kim-TOP a little/just pretty-ADN FN-NOM not-DEC
 ‘(lit.) Kim is not a little/just pretty.’
 ‘(int.) Kim is very (much) pretty.’

3) The following abbreviations are used in glossing the data:

ADN = adnominalizer, ADV = adverbializer, COP = copula, DAT = dative, DEC = declarative, FN: formal noun, GEN: genitive, IMP = imperative, INT = interrogative, NOM = nominative, PST = past, TOP = topic.

4) If it is not stressed, it tends to behave as a typical NPI.

5) Throughout the paper, phonetically stressed syllables are indicated by bold face.

In (2), *com* and *kunyang* seem to be exactly like *yekan/pothong* in that they convey the emphatic positive meaning, or a MN reading, with a negative item. As shown in the next section, however, all the four adverbs have their own idiosyncratic properties with respect to various MN-related phenomena.

3. Diversity in *Yekan*-Adverbs

3.1. Contrastive Focus (CF) Stress on the First Syllable

Lee (2008, 2010a, b) claims that contrastive focus (CF) stress is more of a characteristic of MN than DN. Then, he goes on to argue that CF stress must occur on the first syllable of both *yekan* and *pothong* in order for them to be licensed by MN. However, this claim seems to be too strong. Although it does no harm to stress the first syllable of the adverbs, as far as I can tell, it is not necessary at all. Indeed, the intended MN reading is possible either with stress on the second syllable or no stress at all (i.e. **yekan/pothong** or yekan/pothong) in (1) above.⁶⁾

In contrast, *com* does need to be stressed in order to be licensed by MN. If it is not stressed, the sentence in which it occurs cannot have the intended emphatic positive meaning but only the meaning of higher-degree negation. In addition to stress, *com* must be phonologically separated by a preceding word by at least short pause to get licensed by MN. If it is phonologically dependent on the preceding word, it can only have a DN-reading.

The difference between *yekan/pothong* and *com* can be accounted for by different degrees of fossilization. That is, *yekan* and *pothong* are fossilized

6) In fact, the phonetic experiment Lee (2010b) conducted to show the importance of the stress on the first syllable of *yekan/pothong* for MN did not include *yekan*. Moreover, he did not use *pothong* in his experiment but *pothong-ulo* 'in a normal degree', which is a form that a noun (but not an adverb) *pothong* 'normality' is combined with a postposition *-ulo* 'to'. *Pothong* in (1) and *pothong* in *pothong-ulo* are fundamentally different from each other in not only their parts of speech but also their degrees of fossilization. That is, *pothong* in (1) is fossilized to have a MN reading without any previous context, whereas *pothong* in *pothong-ulo* is not fossilized but used with the postposition *-ulo* to yield the meaning 'in a normal degree'.

enough to go along with the MN reading without any phonetic/phonological help, whereas *com* is less fossilized and needs CF stress for it.

Let us now turn to *kunyang* 'just'. It behaves similar to *yekan/pothong* rather than to *com* in this respect. That is, CF stress on the first syllable does not seem to be a necessary condition for a MN reading. We can get the emphatic positive meaning even with the stress on the second syllable or with no stress at all. From this fact, it can be also concluded that *kunyang* is also more fossilized than *com*. That *kunyang* is relatively highly fossilized for MN is also supported by the fact that its synonym, *kuce* 'just', cannot be licensed by MN.⁷⁾

Regarding the interaction of phonetic stress and MN, what seems to be important is the stress on the syllable that immediately precedes the negative marker *anh-* 'not'. For instance, both in (1) and (2), the CF marker *-i/ka* precedes *anh-* and it is much more natural to stress this marker rather than not doing so. One might argue that they are and should be stressed simply because they are CF markers, but it is not the case. In (1), the CF marker can be omitted, and once it is omitted, the formal noun *-ci* should be stressed.⁸⁾

3.2. Compatibility with short-form negation (SFN)

One of the most important characteristics of MN in Korean has been argued to be its inability to go along with the short-form negation (SFN), which is a clitic *an-* (e.g. Lee 2008, 2010b). However, Carston & Noh (1996) provide some counterexamples to this widely assumed characteristic of Korean MN. In this subsection, I provide one more piece of evidence that supports their claim.

7) In this sense, English *just* is more similar to *kuce* than *kunyang*, for it is rarely used in a MN context.

8) In (2), the nominative marker *-i* cannot be omitted, and thus the formal noun *kes* cannot be stressed.

- (3) a. Kim-un yekan/pothong/**com**/kunyang yeppu-n
 Kim-TOP some/commonly/a little/just pretty-ADN
 kes-i ani-ya
 FN-NOM not-DEC
 ‘(lit.) Kim is not some/commonly/a little/just pretty.’
 ‘(int.) Kim is very pretty.’
- b. Kim-un *yekan/*pothong/***com**/kunyang an yepp-e
 Kim-TOP some/commonly/a little/just not pretty-DEC
 ‘(lit.) Kim is not some/commonly/a little/just pretty.’
 ‘(int.) Kim is very pretty.’

As shown in (3a), all the four adverbs can be used with the LFN to be licensed by MN. What is interesting is that *kunyang* (but not the others) can even be used with the SFN for MN as shown in (3b), which shows that Lee’s (2010a, b) claim that MN can take only the LFN but not the SFN is too strong. Rather, compatibility of the SFN with MN seems to depend on which lexical item is used.

In fact, Lee (2010a: 66) points out that “*yekan*, but not *pothong*, is used in a short form negation with an MN reading recently by a very limited group of younger people”. Indeed, I found two such cases on the internet, which will be discussed in more detail below.

3.3. Compatibility with CT Marker *-(N)un* and CF Marker *-i/Ka*

Horn (2001) suggests as one of three diagnostics for MN in English that MN goes along with contrastive *but* but not with concessive *but*. In Korean, according to Lee (2008, 2010a, b), the distinction between concession and contrast is made by the contrastive topic (CT) marker *-(n)un* and the CF marker *-i/ka*. That is, only *-(n)un* is used for concession. However, contrary to Lee, the four adverbs are not categorically helpless with concessive *-(n)un* to the same degree.

(4) A: I think Kim is really pretty. She must be the most popular girl in her class.

B: I don't think so.

pilok (?)yekan/(?)pothong/*com/*kunyang yeppu-n
 although some/commonly/a little/just pretty-ADN
 kes-un ani-ciman,
 FN-TOP not-but

‘(lit.) Although (she) is not some/commonly/a little/just pretty,
 ‘(int.) Although Kim is very pretty,)
 she cannot make friends with her class mates with that
 personality.

As shown in (4B), difference exists between *yekan/pothong* and *com/kunyang* in terms of their compatibility with concessive *-(n)un*. That is, whereas the co-occurrence of the concessive *-(n)un* and *yekan/pothong* gives rise to just a slight, if any, unacceptability in the context given in (4),⁹⁾ the co-occurrence of the concessive *-(n)un* and *com/kunyang* causes a total infelicity.

That *yekan* and *pothong* are compatible with concessive *-(n)un* can also be explained by their high degree of fossilization as an emphatic positive marker. That is, it is not unreasonable to assume that the adverbs, together with the LFN, have been so much used as a MN-taker that the meaning of emphatic positivity is conventionalized into these adverbs. More generally, “[s]omething that was not originally employed as a means of expressing a thought may eventually come to do this because it has constantly been used in cases of the same kind. A thought which to begin with was only suggested by an expression may come to be explicitly asserted by it” (Frege 1897: 241).

3.4. Compatibility with NPIs

Horn (2001) claims that MN does not trigger negative polarity items

9) The acceptability judgment given in (4) is based on five (including the author) native speakers of Korean.

(NPIs). This is clearly shown in (5), in which no *yekan*-adverb can trigger a NPI *amwuto* ‘anybody’ (Lee 2010).

- (5) **amwuto* *yekan*/pothong/**com**/*kunyang* *yeppu-n*
 anybody some/commonly/a little/just pretty-ADN
 kes-i *ani-ya*
 FN-NOM not-DEC
 ‘(lit.) Anybody is not some/commonly/a little/in a normal de-
 gree pretty.’
 ‘(int.) Nobody is very pretty.’

As far as I know, no satisfactory explanation has been proposed as to why MN cannot go along with NPIs. At least in this case, where the *yekan*-adverbs cannot take the NPI *amwuto*, the incompatibility comes from the fact that one single negative marker, *ani-* in this case, must have two different functions at the same time, one as a DN marker and the other as a non-DN (e.g. MN) marker. It is evident that one cannot metalinguistically negate the property of someone’s being pretty (thus arguing that the person is pretty) and descriptively negate it (thus arguing that the same person is not pretty) at the same time.

Whatever the correct answer is, what is important here is that the example in (5) clearly shows that the *yekan*-adverbs must not be treated as NPI adverbs since NPIs are usually compatible with other NPIs. This contradicts with the previous studies that treat the *yekan*-adverbs as adverb NPIs (e.g. Carston & Noh 1996, Cho & Lee 2002, Lee & Cho 2004).

3.5. Necessity of Precedent Utterance

Horn (2001) claims that MN can be defined as “a device for objecting to a previous utterance on any grounds whatever, including the conventional or conversational implicata it potentially induces, its morphology, its style or register, or its phonetic realization” (Horn 2001: 363). What is crucial here is that in order for MN to exist at all, there should be some previous utterance that can be metalinguistically negated. In this

fossilized (or lexicalized) so much that it is not used for MN anymore.

It is also important to note that *yekan* and *pothong* can be used to affirm (rather than deny) a previous utterance.

- (8) Speaker 1: Kim-un yeppe
 Kim-TOP pretty
 ‘Kim is pretty.’
- Speaker 2: mac-a. yekan/pothong/??**com**/*kunyang
 right-DEC some/commonly/a little/just
 yeppu-n kes-i ani-ya
 pretty-ADN FN-NOM not-DEC
 ‘Right. (She) is very pretty.’

As shown in (8), *yekan* and *pothong* but not *com* and *kunyang* can be used to affirm a previous utterance. This further supports the view that *yekan* and *pothong* are fossilized enough to have the emphatic positive meaning as their own lexical meaning when they are used with negative items.

3.6. Necessity of Second Conjunct

With respect to the possibility of allowing a second conjunct, the four *yekan*-adverbs still differ from one another. In Korean, MN normally takes the form of A-*ka anila* B ‘Not A but B’. However, *yekan* does not seem to allow the second conjunct (B) to be present, as shown in (9).¹¹⁾

- (9) *Kim-un *yekan/(?)pothong/**com**/kunyang yeppu-n
 Kim-TOP some/commonly/a little/just pretty-ADN
 kes-i anila emcheng yeppe
 FN-NOM not very pretty
 ‘Kim is not a little pretty but very pretty.’

Here, when the adverb is *yekan*, the second conjunct is awkward because

11) The acceptability judgment in (9) is based on four (including the author) native speakers of Korean.

it sounds totally redundant. *Pothong* seems to be more acceptable than *yekan*, but still, the sentence without the second conjunct seems to be preferred.

In contrast, *com* and *kunyang* are more felicitous with the second conjunct than without it. That is, with these adverbs, although the emphatic positive meaning can be inferred (through conversational implicature), it sounds more natural with the second conjunct overtly expressed. This shows that *com* and *kunyang* are closer to typical MN-taker than *yekan* and *pothong*.

The idiosyncrasy of *yekan* and *pothong*, again, can be attributed to their relatively high degree of fossilization. Since they lexically express the emphatic positive meaning together with the negative item, it is redundant to repeat the intended positive meaning again in the following clause. The degraded acceptability in (9) can be explained by this redundancy. Note that *yekan* seems to be more fossilized than *pothong* in this respect, which has been also pointed out by Lee (2010b).

3.7. Possibility of Rhetorical Question

Lee & Cho (2004) propose the possibility of being used in a rhetorical question as one crucial difference between *yekan/pothong* and other NPI adverbs. Other *yekan*-adverbs, that is, *com* and *kunyang*, can also be used in rhetorical questions.

- (10) Kim-i yekan/pothong/**com**/kunyang yeppu-ni?
 Kim-NOM some/commonly/a little/just pretty-INT
 ‘Kim is very pretty.’

As shown in (10), all the four adverbs allow the rhetorical meaning of the question, which is ‘Kim is very pretty’ instead of its literal meaning ‘Is Kim a little/commonly/a little/simply pretty?’.

Although *kunyang* can be used in a rhetorical question, it is different from the other adverbs in that if it is used in a rhetorical question, an utterance that emphasizes what has been expressed by the rhetorical question is expected to follow (although it is not necessary) as in (11).

- (11) Kim-i kunyang yeppu-ni? acwu yeppu-ci.
 Kim-NOM just pretty-INT? very pretty-DEC
 ‘(lit.) Is Kim just pretty? She is very pretty.’

3.8. Possibility of Rhetorical Declarative

Yekan and *pothong* also can be used in a rhetorical declarative with *-yaci* ‘should’. For instance, although *khe-yaci* ‘tall-should’ literally means ‘should be tall’, it can mean ‘very tall’ with *yekan* and *pothong*, as in (12).

- (12) Kim-i yekan/pothong khe-yaci.
 Kim-NOM some/commonly tall-should
 ‘Kim is very tall.’

This rhetorical use of *-yaci* is also possible with *com* but not with *kunyang*, as shown in (13), which indicates that *kunyang* is less fossilized than *com* for the use of rhetorical declarative.

- (13) Kim-i com/*kunyang khe-yaci.
 Kim-NOM some/just tall-should
 ‘(int.) Kim is very tall.’

3.9. Difference in Collocational Patterns

The *yekan*-adverbs also show difference in their collocational patterns. I will not attempt to describe all the differences exhaustively in this paper. Instead, I will introduce just two cases: co-occurrence with the LFN *-ci anh-* ‘not’ and with the suffix *-nayki* ‘a person of’. First, contrary to Lee (2010b), it is hard to get an MN reading when *com* combines with the LFN *-ci anh-*. Instead, it can combine with the form *-n kes-i ani-* ‘not’ as shown in (2), which is repeated below for convenience.

- (2) Kim-un **com**/kunyang yeppu-n kes-i ani-ya
 Kim-TOP a little/just pretty-ADN FN-NOM not-DEC
 ‘(lit.) Kim is not a little/just pretty’
 ‘(int.) Kim is very (much) pretty.’

Note that when *com* co-occurs with *-ci anh-*, the meaning, even with the strong stress on *com*, is strongly biased to DN rather than MN, as in (14).

- (14) Kim-un **com** yeppu-ci anh-ta
 Kim-TOP a little pretty-ADV not-DEC
 ‘Kim is not a little pretty.’
 (= Kim is not pretty to a little degree (but not to a high degree).)

Also note that although *kunyang* is not as bad as *com* with *-ci anh-*, it is also much more natural with *-n kes-i ani-*.

Second, the suffix *-nayki* ‘a person of’ can combine with *yekan* and *pothong* but not with *com* and *kunyang*. For instance, *yekan/pothon-nayki* means ‘a person of a normal ability (but not of a high ability)’, and this can be licensed by MN as shown in (15).

- (15) Kim-un yekan/pothon-nayki-ka ani-ya
 Kim-TOP a little/common-a person of-NOM not-DEC
 ‘Kim is not a person of a normal ability.’
 (= Kim is a person of a high ability’.)

However, *com* and *kunyang* are not allowed to be combined with *-nayki* at all. This difference in collocational patterns does not seem to have to do with their different degrees of fossilization. Rather, it must be attributed to each word’s own lexical property that has been established through their own history.

3.10. Peculiarity of *Yekan*

In this last subsection, I will focus on *yekan* and show how it is different from the other *yekan*-adverbs. First, unlike the other three, the meaning of *yekan* is unclear to many native speakers of Korean, including the author. That is, if one is asked what the meaning of *yekan* is, one cannot easily answer the question. In this respect, it is not surprising that Lee (2010a) provides ‘relatively’ as the meaning of *yekan*, which is quite different from the meanings in a dictionary, that is, ‘a little, some’.

The fact that the meaning of *yekan* is unclear has an important effect on viewing it as a MN-taking adverb, because if the degree denoted by *yekan* is unclear, how can one know which degree is denied by using the adverb? In other words, *yekan* lacks a “(quantitative) q-value” in Israel’s (1996) terms, and thus had better be treated as part of the construction, *yekan -ci anh-* ‘very (much) -’, rather than as a word that has its own meaning and pragmatic function. This naturally leads to the second characteristic of *yekan*, which is that, contrary to some researchers, it does not have any special pragmatic function of its own.

For instance, Lee (2010b) and Lee & Cho (2004) have provided different pragmatic functions for *yekan*. First, Lee (2010b) claims that the function of *yekan* is to deny the presupposition made either by the speaker or the hearer that expresses a normal degree of some state. But this is not true. As already shown in (8), repeated below, the speaker does not have to deny what the hearer has in his/her mind about the degree of Kim’s prettiness, whether it is a normal degree or not.

- (8) Speaker 1: Kim-un yeppe.
 Kim-TOP pretty
 ‘Kim is pretty.’

Speaker 2: mac-a. yekan/pothong/??com/*kunyang
 right-DEC some/commonly/a little/just
 yepu-n kes-i ani-ya
 pretty-ADN FN-NOM not-DEC
 ‘Right. (She) is very pretty.’

And as shown in (16), the speaker can use *yekan* even if she does not deny what was in her mind about the degree of Kim's prettiness at the time of utterance.

- (16) na-nun yeycen-pwute Kim-i yekan yeppu-ci
 I-TOP long.ago-since Kim-NOM some pretty-ADV
 anh-ta-nun kes-ulal-ass-ta
 not-DEC-ADN FN-ACCknow-PST-DEC
 'I have known that Kim is pretty since long ago.'

That is, even though the speaker has known that Kim is very pretty from long ago, she can still utter sentence (16) without any problem.

On the other hand, Lee & Cho (2004: 152) argue that *yekan* "functions to decrease the degree the speaker intends", and this makes the utterance less assertive and thus more polite than emphatic adverbs like *acwu* 'very'. However, even if it is possible that *yekan* had served this function in the past, this politeness is no longer at present stage. That is, no difference exists between *yekan* and *acwu* in terms of politeness, which is shown by the fact that both words can be used in either polite or impolite settings without any problem. Therefore, *yekan* is just an emphatic marker and does not have any special pragmatic function as Lee (2010b) and Lee & Cho (2004) argue.

A third property of *yekan* is that it is used more and more as just an emphatic adverb without any negative marker. I found at least 17 cases of *yekan* being used as a simple emphatic marker without a negative item. In these cases, *yekan* is just like an emphatic adverb *acwu* 'very' as shown in (17). Both examples are from Google search.

- (17) a. ... yekan elyepney-yo.
 ... some difficult-DEC
 '... is very difficult.'
 b. ... yekan him-i tune-yo.
 ... some force-NOM cost-DEC
 '... is very exhausting.'

Note that this property is specific to *yekan*, and the rest of the *yekan*-verbs cannot be used as a simple emphatic marker. This last characteristic of *yekan* seems to be closely related to its first property, that is, its unclear meaning. That is, the change in the usage of *yekan* is motivated by that 1) its lexical meaning is lost and that 2) the frequency of the construction *yekan -ci anh-* is so low that it is forgotten by many speakers, younger speakers in particular.

4. Conclusion

So far in this paper, we have looked at how the four *yekan*-adverbs are similar to and different from one another. Basically, I agree with Lee (2010a, b) that they are different from normal NPI adverbs and should not be treated as ordinary NPIs, because they are not used to deny the truth-functional meaning of the utterance in which they occur.

At the same time, they are so different from each other that it is hard to put them into a single category. Overall, *yekan* and *pothong* seem to be more fossilized than *com* and *kunyang*. Among the former two words, *yekan* is more fossilized in that it seems to have lost its inherent lexical meaning and even can be used as an emphatic adverb without any negative item by a number of Korean speakers.¹²⁾

Now let us investigate which *yekan*-adverb can be considered to be licensed by MN. In doing so, I provide Table 1, which summarizes part of the results of the discussion in Section 3. For each *yekan*-adverb, values that correspond to the values for MN are ✓-marked. So, the more ✓ is in a column, the more the adverb for that column is likely to be licensed by MN. Note that it is hard to make a clear distinction between adverbs

12) One reviewer showed uneasiness about accounting for the difference between the four adverbs by the mechanism of (semantic) fossilization, claiming that there can and must be other more principled ways to explain the difference. Of course, it may well be possible that a more principled explanation is awaiting us. However, it is important to note that I am not dealing with every semantic/pragmatic difference between the four adverbs but focusing on the differences in terms of their relationship to MN, and (at least) these differences can be successfully accounted for by relying on the notion of (semantic) fossilization. Thus, I leave the issue of whether the differences are due to some other factor(s) as a future research topic.

that are licensed by MN and ones that are not. Rather, we can only say one adverb is more likely to be licensed by MN than other adverb.

Table 1. Characteristics of *yekan*-adverbs Related to MN

	yekan	pothong	com	kunyang	MN
Necessity of CF stress	no	no	✓yes	no	yes
Compatibility with SFN	✓no	✓no	✓no	yes	no
Compatibility with CF <i>-i/ka</i>	✓yes	yes	✓yes	✓yes	yes
Compatibility with CT <i>-(n)un</i>	yes	✓yes	✓no	✓no	no
Compatibility with NPIs	✓no	✓no	✓no	✓no	no
Previous Utterance	prohibited	not required	✓required	✓required	required
Second conjunct	prohibited	not preferred	✓preferred	✓preferred	required

Based on Table 1, we can conclude that *com* is the best candidate for a MN-taking adverb, satisfying all the characteristics of MN-taking adverbs. The adverb *kunyang* follows it, which is followed by *pothong*, which is followed by *yekan*.¹³⁾

This conclusion somewhat contradicts Lee's (2010b) claim that *yekan* and *pothong* are the main MN-taking adverbs. According to the proposed analysis, these two adverbs (*yekan* in particular, due to its peculiarity discussed in 3.10) have a relatively low degree of compatibility with MN.

Finally, I introduce one group of adverbs that can be thought of as PPI counterparts of the *yekan*-adverbs: *ecikanhi* 'fairly', *cektanghi* 'moderately, properly' and *cakcak* 'moderately'. All these degree adverbs are used in utterances of certain types such as imperatives and rhetorical declara-

13) *Pothong* is a better candidate than *yekan* because it does not prohibit the possibility of a second conjunct and a previous utterance.

tives (cf. section 3.8) without any negative marker, and have an emphatically negative strong degree. An example is shown in (18).

- (18) chayk com ecikanhi/cektanghi/cakcak ilke-la.
 book please fairly/moderately/moderately read-IMP
 ‘(lit.) Read books fairly/moderately/moderately.’
 ‘(int.) Do not read books too much.’

As shown above, even though there is no negative marker in the sentence, the speaker is ordering the hearer *not* to read books too much. As far as I know, no previous study on negation has dealt with these adverbs. Interestingly, the *yekan*-adverbs and their PPI counterparts do not seem to fit into the lexicalization patterns of PPIs and NPIs proposed by Israel (1996).¹⁴ How they can be related to normal NPIs and PPIs is an interesting topic for future research.

References

- Carston, Robyn. and Eun-Ju Noh. (1996). A truth-functional account of metalinguistic negation, with evidence from Korean. *Language Sciences* 18.1-2, 485-504.
- Cho, S.-Y. and Lee, H.-G. (2002). Syntactic and pragmatic properties of the NPI *yekan* in Korean. *The Japanese/Korean Linguistics* Vol. 10, 509-521.
- Frege, Gottlob. (1897). Logic. In Beaney, M. (ed.) *The Frege reader*, 227-250. Blackwell.
- Horn, Laurence R. (2001). *A natural history of negation*. CSLI Publications.
- Israel, Michael. (1996). Polarity sensitivity as lexical semantics. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 19, 619-666.
- Lee, Chungmin. (2008). Contrastive (predicate) topic, intonation, and scalar meanings. In Lee, Chungmin, Gordon, M. And Bruing, D. (eds.) *Topic and focus: meaning and intonation from a cross-linguistic perspective*,

14) Lee (2010b) made the same claim with respect to *yekan* and *pothong*.

151-175. Dordrecht: Springer.

- Lee, Chungmin. (2010a). Information structure in PA/SN or descriptive/metalinguistic negation: with reference to scalar implicatures. In Shu, Dingfang and Ken Turner (eds.) *Contrasting meaning in languages of the East and West*, 33-73. Berne: Peter Lang.
- Lee, Chungmin. (2010b). Metalinguistically negated adverbials (written in Korean). *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 35.3, 817-836.
- Lee, H.-G. and Cho, S.-Y. (2004). Four types of adverb NPIs in Korean and their pragmatics and syntax. *Discourse and Cognition* 11.2, 141-163.

Ilkyu Kim
Department of English
Kangwon National University
Joongang-ro 346, Samcheok-si, Gangwon-do, 245-711
ikkim@kangwon.ac.kr

Received: October 31, 2014

Revised version received: December 17, 2014

Accepted: December 22, 2014